UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,403	11/10/2003	Satoshi Mizutani	20050/0200484-US0	4411
7278 7590 01/25/2007 DARBY & DARBY P.C. P. O. BOX 5257			· EXAMINER	
			REICHLE, KARIN M	
NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/25/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			NI				
	1	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/705,403	MIZUTANI ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Karin M. Reichle	3761				
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
WHIO - Extending - Extending - If No - Fails Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		·	•				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 N	ovember 2006.					
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
•	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1.5-7.9-14 and 18</u> is/are pending in th	ne application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) 🗌	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,5-7,9-14 and 18</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2006 is/a	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objec	cted to by the Examiner.				
•	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Offic	e Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,					
· ·	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	ved in this National Stage				
* 1	application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attack	***************************************						
Attachmei	ողչ) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summar	v (PTO-413)				
2) D Noti	Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Patent Application .				

Application/Control Number: 10/705,403

Art Unit: 3761

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11-13-06 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. The substitute specification filed 11-13-06 does not comply with 37 CFR 1.121. For example, the marked up copy of the Summary of the Invention section of the specification does not show the text of each paragraph of the 3-14-06 substitute specification amended to arrive at the paragraphs of the 11-13-06 substitute specification, i.e. the paragraphs shown amended are not the same as the paragraphs previously presented. For example the paragraph bridging pages 2-3 of the marked up copy of the 11-13-06 substitute specification is not the same as either the second or third full paragraphs on page 3 of the 3-06 substitute specification. Furthermore, the substitute specification of 11-13-06 still does not correct errors in the 3-06 specification, e.g. see page 30, last line. See paragraph 5 infra.

Specification

3. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

For Example:

Drawings

4. The drawings were received on 11-13-06. These drawings are approved by the Examiner.

Description

- 5. The substitute specification including the abstract filed 11-13-06 has not been entered. Therefore see the following paragraphs.
- 6. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: the abstract, the first sentence, page 22, lines 13-16.
- 7. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification is still replete with informalities. For example: 1) The Summary of the Invention section, i.e. a description of the <u>claimed invention</u>, not the detailed description of the invention, regardless of length, and the invention of the claims are still not commensurate in scope, see MPEP 608.01(d).

Application/Control Number: 10/705,403 Page 4

Art Unit: 3761

It is noted the extraneous descriptive matter in the Summary should be included in the Detailed Description instead, if not already. 2) On page 4, line 13, the numeral in parenthesis should be deleted. This also applies to page 13, lines 14, 23 and 31. 3) On page 17, line 17 from the bottom line, "3" still should be --3(A)-(B)--. A complete, consistent description of the invention should be set forth throughout the application. The specification should be carefully reviewed and revised, as necessary, to overcome all the informalities. Applicant is thanked in advance for the continuing cooperation in placing the specification in proper form.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

8. Claims 1, 5-7, 9-14 and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1, lines 7-10 and 18-21 are redundant, see lines 4-6 and 13-15, i.e. "bonded to each other enclosing". On line 13, "a garment" should be --the garment--. In claim 5, line 2, ", which faces" should be --facing--. In claim 7, last section, line 1 thereof is redundant, see last two lines of claim 1, and on line 2, "angle" is redundant, i.e. see "slope". With regard to claim 14, the remarks with respect to claim 1 apply to similar language in this claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/705,403

Art Unit: 3761

10. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. With regard to claim 18, this new claim now requires the total circumference of the opening formed with the backing sheet of the sub-sheet body and a surface of the mini sheet piece is within a certain range. While the originally filed application at the sentence bridging pages 26-27 disclosed the "whole girth", i.e. the circumference, of the insertion opening, i.e. the opening formed between the backing sheet and the surface of the mini sheet piece facing such sheet is within a certain range, this is not what is claimed. If Applicant maintains such claim language the portions of the originally filed application which provide support for the full scope of the claimed structure in a single embodiment should be set forth. Note MPEP 2163.06(I).

Page 5

11. Claims 1, 5-7, 9-14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The last two lines of claim 1 are indefinite because it is unclear what is bonded, see

Claim Language Interpretation section infra, i.e. are the bodies not bonded to each other only

directly or not only both directly and indirectly? If the latter, such is inconsistent with the

remainder of the last section of claim 1 because lines 28-30 describe a bonding in which all

portions of the bodies are indirectly bonded to one another. Also, on lines 22-24, which surface

sheet is Applicant referring to, i.e. each of the bodies includes such a sheet, i.e. a positive

Art Unit: 3761

antecedent basis for "the surface sheet" should be set forth? With regard to claim 14, the remarks with respect to claim 1 apply to similar language in this claim.

Claim Language Interpretation

12. The claim terminology is interpreted in light of the specific definitions on page 5, lines 10-11 and the sentence bridging pages 6-7. Any other claim language not specifically defined has been interpreted in view of the usual and common meaning of such, i.e. the dictionary definition. It is noted that the terminology "bonded" includes indirect bonding or direct bonding. A product by process is recited by line 2 of claim 6, i.e. see MPEP 2113, i.e. patentability is determined based on the end product of a product by process claim, not the process. The end product of claim 6 is interpreted to include a portion of the main sheet body being bent. It is noted that the terminology "mini" in claims 5 and 18 has not been claimed with respect to any other structure, i.e. mini compared to what, and thereby is considered relative absent specific dimensions thereof. Due to the lack of clarity with regard to the last two lines of claim 1 and similar language in claim 14, the language will be interpreted to require at a minimum a main sheet body and a sub-sheet body bonded, directly or indirectly, to each other at their longitudinal side edges and not being bonded directly anywhere else. Due to the lack of clarity with regard to lines 22-24 of claim 1 and similar language in claim 14, the surface sheet will be interpreted as that of the main sheet body. With regard to claim 18, note again MPEP 2163.06(I).

Art Unit: 3761

Allowable Subject Matter

13. The claims as best understood see discussion supra patentably distinguish over the prior art. As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant's reply must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37 CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's remarks have been carefully considered but are either deemed moot in that the issues discussed have not been reraised or deemed not persuasive for the reasons set forth supra.

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karin M. Reichle whose telephone number is (571) 272-4936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tanya Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3761

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Karin M. Reichle Primary Examiner Art Unit 3761 Page 8

KMR January 22, 2007